

Appl. No. 09/964,307
Amdt. dated April 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants received the Office Action dated January 23, 2006, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-7, 11-14, 18-20 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Suorsa (U.S. Publication No. US2004/0226010 A1, hereinafter "Suorsa"). With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 6, 7, and 14. Based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicants believe all claims are in condition for allowance.

Suorsa discloses a central provisioning network 31. Each newly installed device, such as Devices 1, 2, 3, ...N shown in Figure 7, include an agent 36 that requests configuration data from the central provisioning network 31. The provisioning network 31 includes a central file system 34 that contains various software components. The provisioning network 31 also includes a database 32 that can be accessed by the agent in the device to be configured to determine how that device should be configured. The database 32 identifies the addresses of the various software components in the file system 34 to be used to configure the device. In sum, Suorsa discloses a central provisioning network that comprises the universe of all possible configuration data that any given device can use to configure itself.

As amended, the method of claim 1 now requires "identifying from among a plurality of servers, each of the plurality of servers having configuration data that can be used to configure another server, which of said plurality of servers includes configuration data suitable for use by the server to be configured." Thus, per claim 1, each of a plurality of servers has configuration data. The configuration data of each such server can be used to configure another server. Claim 1 further requires identifying which server has suitable configuration data. In Suorsa, by contrast, no such identification is disclosed or even necessary because the provisioning mechanism of Suorsa is centralized. All devices to be configured access a common provisioning network. Whereas the provisioning

**Appl. No. 09/964,307
Amdt. dated April 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2006**

mechanism of Suorsa is centralized, the provisioning of claim 1 in effect is distributed. At least for this reason, claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable.

Applicants made the same or similar amendments to independent claims 7 and 14. Accordingly claims 7 and 14 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable for the same or similar reason as provided above for claim 1.

Applicants opt not to amend independent claim 23. The Examiner rejected claim 23 stating only that "[c]laim 23 contains similar subject matter and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1." Office Action page 5. Claim 23, however, provides alternative options for configuring a server depending on whether "automatic configuration has been specified for the server." Claim 1 has no such limitation. Clearly, claim 23 is different from claim 1. The Examiner has not identified where in Suorsa a teaching of this limitation can be found. Further, Applicants find no such teaching in Suorsa. At least for this reason, claim 23 is allowable.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are

Appl. No. 09/964,307
Amdt. dated April 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2006

hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400